

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 11 are amended.

Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, at page 2, lines 14-22 and at page 9, lines 29-page 10, line 11. In particular, page 2, lines 14-22 discloses that conventional agents would not recognize that a document has changed if the change is below a certain threshold.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Ismail at the interview held October 14, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute the record of the interview.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 6, 8, 11-13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over EP 1050831 in view of Chow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,175); and rejects claims 4-5 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over EP 1050831 in view of EP 1111517. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, neither EP 1050831, Chow nor EP 1111517, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests at least a document representation storage further storing a predetermined number of most recently changed versions of documents irrespective of a document change monitoring element's and user's indication of significance, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 11.

The Office Action, at page 3, acknowledges that EP 1050831 does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features of claims 1 and 11.

Chow, on the other hand, at col. 4, lines 6-39, discloses caching pages of documents requested by a client and forwarding the cached pages to the client for review. If the client shows no interest, the cached pages are deleted. See, col. 4, lines 16-17. On the contrary,

claims 1 and 11 recite that the document representation storage further storing a predetermined number of most recently changed versions of documents irrespective of a document change monitoring element's and user's indication of significance. Chow does not disclose or suggest this feature. Therefore, the combination of EP 1050831 and Chow does not render obvious the features of independent claims 1 and 11.

EP 1111517 does not compensate for the above-noted deficiencies of EP 1050831 and Chow.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 11 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-10 and 12-17 depend from the respective independent claims, and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/hs

Date: October 24, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
